



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. II.—1. *De Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine, Indole, et Auctoritate, Commentatio Philologico-critica.* Scripsit GULIELMUS GESENIUS, Theologiæ Doctor, et in Universitate Literarum Fridericianâ Professor Ordinarius. Halæ, impensis Librariæ Rengerianæ, 1815.

2. *Jesu Christi Natalitia piè celebranda, Academia Fridericianæ Halensis et Vitebergensis consociatæ Civibus indicunt Prorektor et Senatus.* Inest GULIEL. GESENI, Theol. D. et P. P. O. *de Samaritarum Theologią ex Fontibus ineditis Commentatio.* Halæ, in Librariâ Rengerianâ.

3. *Anecdota Orientalia*, edidit et illustravit GULIEL. GESENIUS, Philosophiæ et Theologiæ Doctor, hujusque in Academiâ Fridericianâ Halensi Professor publicus ordinarius, Societatum Asiaticæ Parisiensis et Philosophicæ Cantabrigiæ Socius. *Fasciculus primus, Carmina Samaritana complectens.* Lipsiæ, 1824. Impensis Typisque Fr. Chr. Guil. Vogelii.

[Also entitled] *Carmina Samaritana e Codicibus Londnensibus et Gothanis*, edidit et Interpretatione Latinâ cum Commentario illustravit GULIEL. GESENIUS &c. *Cum Tabulâ lapidi inscriptâ.* Lipsiæ, 1824.

THE existence of the Pentateuch, or the five books of Moses, among the Samaritans, written in the peculiar alphabetic character which they employed, and which differed much from the Hebrew square character, was known in very ancient times to such of the Fathers, as were acquainted with the Hebrew language. Origen, in commenting upon Numbers xiii. 1, says, *καὶ τούτων μνημονεύει Μωϋσῆς ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις τοῦ Δευτερονομίου, ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ ἐκ τοῦ τῶν Σαμαριτῶν Ἑβραϊκοῦ μετεβόλων, and these things Moses makes mention of in the first part of Deuteronomy, which we have also transferred from the Hebrew copy of the Samaritans.* Again, on Numbers xxi. 13, he says, *καὶ τούτων μίμνηται Μωϋσῆς ἐν Δευτερονομίῳ, ἃ ἐν μόνοις τῶν Σαμαριτῶν εὑρομέν, these things Moses mentions in the book of Deuteronomy, which we found only in the Samaritan copy.* Jerome, in his prologue to the book of Kings, says, *Samaritani etiam Pentateuchum Mosis totidem literis scriptitant, figuris tantum et apicibus discrepantes.* By *totidem literis*, he means as many letters as the Hebrews and Chaldeans used, that is, twentytwo; although the forms of the

Samaritan letters differed from those which the Jews employed. Again, in his *Questiones in Genesin*, on chap. iv. 8, he says, *Quam ob causam, Samaritanorum Hebræa voluminu relegens, inveni &c.*

These, with one or two more references of a similar nature in Origen and Jerome, constitute the evidence which we have that the Samaritan Pentateuch was known, in very ancient times, to such of the Fathers as devoted themselves to the critical study of the Hebrew Scriptures. From the time of Jerome down to the first quarter of the seventeenth century, no traces appear, in the history of criticism and sacred literature, of any knowledge among Christians, whether the Samaritan copy of the law of Moses was still in existence. In the year 1616, Petrus à Valle bought of the Samaritans, at Damascus, a complete copy; which was sent, in 1623, by A. H. de Sancy to the library of the Oratory at Paris. J. Morin briefly described this copy, not long afterwards, in the preface to his edition of the Septuagint, A. D. 1628. Soon after this he published his *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticæ in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum*; in which he extols very highly the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, preferring it above the common Hebrew text. About the same time, from the copy purchased by à Valle, Morin printed the Samaritan text of the Paris Polyglott, and from this Walton printed the Samaritan text in the London Polyglott, with very few corrections.

In the mean time, between the years 1620 and 1630, archbishop Usher, so distinguished for his zeal in the cause of sacred literature, and for the knowledge of it which he himself acquired, had succeeded by persevering efforts in obtaining six additional copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch from the East, some of which were complete, and others incomplete. Five of these are still in England, deposited in different libraries; and one, which the archbishop presented to Ludovicus de Dieu, appears to have been lost.

In 1621, another copy was sent to Italy, which is now in the Ambrosian library at Milan. About the same time, Peiresc procured three copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch; two of which are in the royal library at Paris, and one in that of Barberini at Rome.

To these copies others have since been added; so that Kennicott was able to extend the comparison of Samaritan manuscripts, for his critical collection of various readings, to the number of *sixteen*. Most of them, however, were more or less defective, in regard to parts of the Pentateuch.

The external appearance of these manuscripts, in some respects, agrees with that of the synagogue rolls of the Hebrews; but in many others it differs. All the Samaritan copies in Europe are in the form of books, either folio, quarto, or still smaller; although the Samaritans in their synagogues make use of rolls, as the Jews also do. The letters in the Samaritan copies are simple, exhibiting nothing like the *literæ majusculæ, minusculæ, inversæ, suspensæ* &c. of the Hebrews. They are entirely destitute of vowel points, accents, or diacritical signs, such as are found in Hebrew and Chaldee. Each word is separated from the one which follows it, by a point placed between them; parts of sentences are distinguished by two points; and periods and paragraphs by short lines, or lines and points. The manuscripts differ, however, in regard to some things of this nature. Words of doubtful construction are sometimes marked by a small line over one of the letters. The margin is empty, unless, as is sometimes the case, the Samaritan or Arabic version is placed by the side of the original text. The whole Pentateuch, like the Jewish copy, is divided into paragraphs, which they call קִטְּרִין, *Katsin*. But while the Jews make only fiftytwo or fiftyfour divisions (one to be read each Sabbath in the year), the Samaritans make nine hundred and sixtysix.

The age of some of the Samaritan copies is determined by the date, which accompanies the name of the copyist; in others it is not. Kennicott has endeavored to ascertain the date of all the Samaritan manuscripts, which he compared. But he resorts to conjecture in order to effect this; conjecture supported by no well grounded rules of judging. The *Codex Oratorii*, used by Morin, he supposes to have been copied in the eleventh century; while all the others, except one, are conceded to be of more recent origin. One he assigns to the eighth century. On what uncertain grounds the reasoning of Kennicott and De Rossi about the age of Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts rests, need not be told to any one acquainted with the present state of Hebrew literature.

The materials, on which the Samaritan manuscripts are written, are either parchment or silk paper. Ordinary paper has been used, in recent times, only to supply some of the defects in them.

The Christian world, before Morin published his famous *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticæ in utrumque Samaritanorum Penta-*

teuchum, (1631,) had been accustomed to resort only to the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures, as exhibiting the well authenticated and established text of the Mosaic law. From this remark may be excepted the few, who attached a high value to the Septuagint version, and preferred many of its readings to those, which are found in the Jewish Scriptures. But the publication of Morin soon excited a controversy, which, even at the present hour, has not wholly subsided. As the Samaritan copy of the law, in a multitude of places, agreed with the version of the Seventy, Morin maintained that the authority of the Samaritan, particularly when supported by the Septuagint, was paramount to that of the Jewish text. He labored, moreover, to show, that in a multitude of passages, which in that text as it now stands are obscure and difficult, or unharmonious, the Samaritan offers the better reading; that the Jews have corrupted their Scriptures by negligence, or ignorance, or superstition; and that the safe and only way of purifying them is, to correct them from the Samaritan in connexion with the Septuagint.

The signal was now given for the great contest, which ensued. Cappel, in his *Critica Sacra*, followed in the steps of Morin; but De Muis, Hottinger, Stephen Morin, Buxtorf, Fuller, Leusden, A. Pfeiffer, each in separate works published within the seventeenth century, attacked the positions of Morin and Cappel. Their principal aim was to overthrow his positions, rather than to examine the subject before them in a critical and thorough manner.

Much less like disputants, and more like impartial critics, did Father Simon, Walton in his *Prolegomena*, and Le Clerc conduct themselves, relative to the question about the value and authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch. In particular, Simon has thrown out suggestions, which imply for substance the same opinions on many controverted points, that the latest and best critics, after all the discussion which has taken place, have adopted.

But during the latter part of the last century, when the fierceness of controversy seemed to have abated, Houbigant, treading in the steps of J. Morin, renewed it, in the *Prolegomena* to his Bible. With him other controvertists united. Kennicott, in various works, A. S. Aquilino, Lobstein, and Alexander Geddes, have all contended for the equal or superior authority of the Samaritan Codex. Houbigant was answered, in a masterly way, by S. Ravius, in his *Exercitationes Philologicae*,

1761. Recently, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Bauer, and Jahn, have discussed the subject in question with a good degree of moderation and acuteness. But they have all inclined to attach considerable value to many of the Samaritan readings; although most of them consider the Samaritan Pentateuch, on the whole, as of inferior authority, compared with the Hebrew.

Thus the matter stood, when Gesenius entered upon the discussion of it in the treatise which is first named at the head of this article. The great extent of critical and philological knowledge which he had acquired, fitted him in a peculiar manner for the difficult task which he undertook; for difficult it would seem to be, to settle a question that had been so long disputed by the master critics, and still not brought to a termination. What those who best knew the talents of this eminent writer would naturally expect, has, for the most part, been accomplished. He has settled the question, (it would seem forever settled it,) about the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch compared with that of the Hebrew; or rather, he has shown, as we shall see by and by, the nature of the various readings exhibited by the Samaritan Pentateuch to be such, that we can place no critical reliance at all upon them. They are all, or nearly all, most evidently the effect of design, or of want of grammatical, exegetical, or critical knowledge; or of studious conformity to the Samaritan dialect; or of effort to remove supposed obscurities, or to restore harmony to passages apparently discrepant. On this part of the subject there can be little or no doubt left, hereafter, in the mind of any sober critic.

Gesenius has divided the various readings, which the Samaritan Pentateuch exhibits, into *eight* different classes, for the sake of more orderly and exact description. The first class consists of such as exhibit *corrections merely of a grammatical nature*. For example, in orthography the *matres lectionis* are supplied; in respect to pronouns, the usual forms are substituted for the unusual ones; the full forms of verbs are substituted for the apocopated forms; the paragogic letters affixed to nouns and participles are omitted, so as to reduce them to usual forms; words of common gender are corrected so as to make the form either masculine or feminine, where the word admits of it, (for example, נער is always written נערה when it is feminine); and the infinitive absolute is often reduced to the form of a finite verb.

The second class of various readings consists of *glosses received into the text*. For the most part these exhibit the true

sense of the original Hebrew ; but they explain the more difficult words by such as seemed to be plainer or more intelligible.

The third class consists of those, in which there is a *substitution of plain modes of expression, in the room of those, which seemed difficult or obscure in the Hebrew text.* The fourth, of those in which *the Samaritan copy is corrected from parallel passages, or apparent defects are supplied from them.* The fifth is made up of *additions or repetitions respecting things said and done ;* which are drawn from the preceding context, and again recorded so as to make the readings in question. The sixth, of *such corrections as were made to remove what was offensive in respect to sentiment,* that is, which conveyed views, or narrated facts, that were deemed improbable by the correctors. For an example, we refer to the famous genealogies in Genesis v. and xi. in which the Samaritan copy has made many alterations, evidently *designed.* In the antediluvian genealogy, the corrections are so made that no one is exhibited as having begotten his first son, after he is one hundred and fifty years old. Thus the Hebrew text represents Jared as having begotten a son at the age of one hundred and sixtytwo years ; but the Samaritan takes one hundred years from this. In the postdiluvian genealogy, it follows a different principle of correction. No one is allowed to have begotten a son, until after he was fifty years of age ; so that one hundred years are added to all those who are represented by the Hebrew text as having had issue under that age, with the exception of Nahor, to whom fifty years are added. The effects of *design* are most visible in all these corrections ; and equally so in the corresponding Septuagint genealogies, we may add, which, while they differ from both the Hebrew and Samaritan, bear the marks of *designed* alteration most evidently impressed upon them. Other examples of a like nature may be found in the Samaritan copy, in Exodus xii. 40. Genesis ii. 2. Genesis xxix. 3, 8. Exodus xxiv. 10, 11.

The seventh class of various readings consists of those, in which *the pure Hebrew idiom is exchanged for that of the Samaritan.* This has respect to many cases of orthography ; to the forms of pronouns ; to some of the forms of verbs, for example, the second person feminine of the præter tense, which in the Samaritan has a *Yodh* paragogic ; and to the forms of nouns etymologically considered.

The eighth class consists of those passages, *where alterations have been made so as to produce conformity to the Samaritan*

theology, worship, or mode of interpretation. For example, where the Hebrew has used a plural verb with the noun אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*, the Samaritan has substituted a verb in the singular number (Genesis xx. 13. xxxi. 53. xxxv. 7. Exodus xxii. 9.) lest the unity of God should seem to be infringed upon. So in many passages, where anthropomorphism or anthropopathy is resorted to by the sacred writer, in relation to God, the Samaritan has substituted different expressions. In Genesis xlix. 7, where Jacob, when about to die, says of Simeon and Levi, *Cursed be their anger* (אָרוּר אַפָּם), the Samaritan has altered it to *lovely is their anger* (אָדִיר אַפָּם). In the blessing of Moses, Deuteronomy xxxiii. 12, Benjamin is styled יְהוָה יְדִידָהּ *beloved of Jehovah*, which the Samaritan has altered to יְדִיד יְהוָה *the hand, the hand of Jehovah shall dwell* &c. In a similar manner, euphemisms are substituted, in various parts of the Pentateuch, for expressions which appeared to the Samaritan critics unseemly or immodest. Finally, in the famous passage in Deuteronomy xxvii. 4, the Samaritan has changed *Ebal* into *Gerizim*, in order to give sanction to the temple which they built, not long after the time of Nehemiah, upon the latter mountain. Kennicott has warmly contested the Hebrew reading here, and defended the Samaritan; but the question was settled against his opinion by Verschuir, in his *Dissertt. Exeget. Philologicae*, published in 1773, to the universal satisfaction, we believe, of all biblical critics.

Some of the classes of various readings here described are hardly intelligible, perhaps, to the cursory and general reader; nor will the difference between some of them, (for example, between the second and third class,) be plain to any reader, who does not consult the work of Gesenius, and compare the examples proposed. Under all the classes of various readings, he has produced a multitude of examples, almost to satiety, so as to remove all rational doubt as to the positions which he advances. Never before did the Samaritan Pentateuch undergo such a thorough critical examination; and never, perhaps, in a case that was difficult and had been long contested, was truth made more evident and convincing. Only four various readings in the whole Samaritan Pentateuch, are considered by Gesenius as preferable perhaps to the Hebrew text. These are the well known passages in Genesis iv. 6. xxii. 13. xlix. 14. and xiv. 14; all of little importance, and all, we are well persuaded, of

such a nature, that the probability is quite in favour of the Hebrew text. But this is not the proper place for a discussion of such a subject, and we forbear to pursue it.

The result of Gesenius' labors has been, so far as we know, to ruin the credit of the Samaritan Pentateuch, as an *authentic* source of correcting the Hebrew records; a result of no small importance, considering the thousands of places in which it differs from the Hebrew, and the excessive value which has been set upon it by critics of great note, in different parts of Europe. The biblical student will henceforth know how little dependence he can place on the Samaritan Codex, to help him out in any difficulties of lower criticism; and he will sincerely rejoice too, that the superior purity of the Jewish Pentateuch over that of rival records differing so often from it, is so solidly established.

Of the sixtyfour quarto pages, which the dissertation of Gesenius occupies, about forty are employed in exhibiting the classes of various readings which have been described. This is the most important and most satisfactory part of the work. About the merits of this, there can hardly be but one opinion, among all who are conversant with sacred criticism. According to the arrangement of the author, this constitutes the second part of his dissertation.

In the first part, he has discussed the difficult questions, which respect the *origin* and *antiquity* of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Here, also, we discover everywhere the hand of a master in criticism; but we are not prepared, by any means, to accede to all the positions which he has taken. To examine them, however, and to state our reasons for dissent, is by far the most difficult part of the task, which we have undertaken. But as the subject is intimately connected with some of the most interesting topics, which have lately been agitated in the critical world, we hope that at least one class of our readers will not be displeased to have it laid before them.

It is the opinion of Gesenius, that the Pentateuch did not receive its *present* form, that is, it was not regularly digested and arranged, until the time of the Babylonish captivity. Of course, the Samaritan Pentateuch must have originated still later. He regards that time as the most probable, from which to date the origin of the Samaritan Codex, when Manasseh, the son in law of Sanballat the Samaritan governor, and brother of the high priest at Jerusalem, went over to the Sama-

ritans, built a temple on mount Gerizim, by the aid of his father in law, and instituted the Mosaic worship there. Many of the peculiar readings of the Samaritan Codex, he thinks, can be accounted for by such a supposition; and at all events, we must suppose that Manasseh carried a copy of the Jewish law along with him.

It must be quite apparent, indeed, that if the Jewish Pentateuch did not receive its present form until the Babylonish exile, the Samaritan Codex must have originated still later; and no time of its origin is more probable, on this ground, than that which Gesenius has assigned to it. But that the Jewish Pentateuch had a much earlier date than is here assigned to it, is what we fully believe. To state all the reasons of this, and to examine all the objections made against this opinion by recent critics, would require a volume, instead of the scanty limits of a review. We shall merely advert therefore, in the first place, to some of the leading reasons why we believe that the Hebrew Pentateuch, with the exception of a very few isolated passages, came from the hand of Moses; next, examine briefly the reasons which are alleged against this; and then endeavor to show why a more ancient date is to be assigned to the Samaritan Pentateuch, than Gesenius gives it.

That the Pentateuch, as to all its essential parts, came from the hand of Moses, appears to be probable from the following considerations.

1. The Pentateuch itself exhibits direct internal evidence, that it was written by Moses.

Thus, in Exodus xvii. 14, after an account of the contest between Israel and Amalek, it is added, *And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in the book*, (בְּסֵפֶר with the article, not בְּסֵפֶר), that is, as the meaning seems obviously to be, in the book already begun and in which other things were recorded, in the well known book. So in Exodus xxiv. 4, 7, after the law had been given at Mount Sinai, it is said, that *Moses wrote all the words of the Lord*, and then, that *he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people*. Afterwards, when many more laws had been added, the *Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words*, Exodus xxxiv. 27. If it be said, All this has respect only to laws or statutes; the answer is easy. In Numbers xxxiii. 1, 2, it is said, that *Moses wrote the goings out* [of the children of Israel] *according to their journeys, by the commandment of the Lord*. This, it will be recollected, was

at the close of their wanderings through the desert, after they had come to the plains of Moab, and were consequently on the very borders of the promised land. The close of the book of Numbers declares, that *these are the commandments and the judgments which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses*. To what can *these* refer, but to the written contents of the preceding book? Finally, in Deuteronomy, which exhibits a repetition of the most important laws for the Jewish nation, *this law, the words of this law, and the book of this law*, are frequently adverted to. So in Deuteronomy xvii. 18, the future king of the Israelites is enjoined to write out for himself a *copy of this law*, that he may learn *to keep all the words of this law* (v. 19); in chapter xxx. 10, mention is made of the *statutes written in this book of the law*; in xxxi. 11, Moses commands that *this law shall be read before all Israel in their hearing*, that (v. 12) *they may observe to do all the words of this law*. Particularly worthy of note are the two following passages; Deuteronomy xxviii. 61, where *every plague not written in this book* is threatened, in case the Israelites are disobedient; and Deuteronomy xxxi. 9—13, 19, 22, compared with xxxi. 24—26, from which it appears not only that Moses wrote some things in the preceding book, but that he wrote until *the whole was completed or finished*, and then deposited the book in the side of the ark of the covenant.

It were easy to add other testimony of the like nature, from the Pentateuch itself; but it is superfluous. The fact, that the Pentateuch itself, *as a whole*, claims to be written by Moses, cannot reasonably be doubted, until it can be shown that it existed, in former days, in numerous distinct volumes, so that a passage in one, which has a reference to its composition by Moses, can be reasonably supposed to relate to nothing farther than the single parcel or small roll, in which such passage is found. But this has never been shown, and never can be. All the evidence before us is of a different nature, inasmuch as it all goes to establish the belief, that the Pentateuch, from time immemorial, has been regarded only as *one* volume.

2. The remaining books of Scripture ascribe the Pentateuch or Jewish law to Moses as its author.

The book of Joshua, although reduced to its *present* form in later times, was undoubtedly composed, in respect to its essential parts, at a very early period. In this book, frequent references may be found to the *book of the law*. For example, Joshua is

commanded to do according to all which the law of Moses commanded ; and it is enjoined upon him that *this book of the law should not depart out of his mouth*, Joshua i. 7, 8. Joshua, in taking leave of the people of Israel, exhorts them to *do all which is written in the book of the law of Moses*, xxiii. 6 ; and he recites, on this occasion, many things contained in it. When the same distinguished leader had taken his final farewell of the tribes, he wrote the words of his address *in the book of the law of God*, xxiv. 26. In like manner, it is said, Joshua viii. 30 seq. that Joshua built an altar on mount Ebal, as *it is written in the book of the law of Moses*, and that *he read all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law*. These references, in a book the substance of which is confessedly of very early date, are of great importance in the investigation of the question, whether the Pentateuch is to be assigned to the time of Moses, or set down, as Gesenius has set it, to the time of the Babylonish exile.

In other historical books, to which the finishing hand was not put until the time of the captivity, but the principal parts of which existed in records of a much older date, the law of Moses is referred to in a similar way. David, on his dying bed, exhorts Solomon, in all things to conduct himself agreeably to what is *written in the law of Moses*, 1 Kings ii. 3. In 2 Kings xiv. 1—6, it is related that Amaziah slew not the children of those, who had murdered his father ; and that he spared them according to *that which is written in the book of the law of Moses* ; a passage of which is then quoted, from Deuteronomy xxxiv. 16. In 2 Kings xxii. 8, Hilkiyah, the high priest, is represented as having found in the temple a book, which is there called *the book of the law* ; in xxiii. 2, *the book of the covenant* ; and in 2 Chronicles xxxiv. 14, *a book of the law of the Lord, given by Moses*. In 2 Kings xxiii. 21—23, Josiah is said to have given orders that the passover should be kept, *as it is written in the book of the covenant*.

In Ezra and Nehemiah frequent references are made to the same book. But as these books were written after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish exile, we will not insist upon their testimony. Gesenius would admit that the Pentateuch was reduced to writing about the commencement of the exile ; and therefore he might except to any citations from books written after this period and appealing to it, as proof that the Penta-

teuch was early committed to writing. But there is one circumstance, in the frequent appeals made to the law of Moses in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which is not easily explained on the ground which he takes. This is, that the appeal is everywhere made to the book of the law, as a book which came from the hand of Moses; which was sanctioned by his authority; which was unhesitatingly and universally admitted to be such by the Jews; and which no one therefore would venture to contradict or call in question. How could the whole Jewish nation be made to believe this, if the Pentateuch had been forged only some half a century before? It cannot be contended that there were not many enlightened men among the Jews, at the time of their return from the captivity. To mention Zorobabel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi, is sufficient to prove this; if we say nothing of many others, who might be added to these. Were not these men, too, *honest* as well as *enlightened*? And if so, how can we suppose them to have palmed the Pentateuch upon the Jewish nation as the work of Moses, when they must have known it not to be so, if it had been composed near, or during, the time of the exile?

In like manner, we might appeal to all the earlier prophets, in confirmation of the idea, that the Pentateuch was, in their day, substantially what it now is. Hosea, Joel, Amos, Micha, and Isaiah appeal to the precepts of the Mosaic law, and to the facts which are related in it; and they appeal to it as a book of paramount authority, which ought to settle every dispute, and to repress every transgressor. The appeals, moreover, which they make, are not merely to particular statutes comprised in the Pentateuch, but to various matters both historical and preceptive, taken without distinction from *all* the present books of the law of Moses.

To produce instances of all these appeals, would occasion too long delay on this part of our subject. We must be content with referring any who may doubt what is here stated, to Rosenmueller on the Pentateuch, (third edition, 1821, *Prolegomena*, page 11,) where he will find a synoptical view of references by the early prophets to the Pentateuch; or to Jahn's *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, where, in his discussion respecting the age of the Pentateuch, ample references may be found to passages quoted by the different writers, during the ages that followed the time of Moses.

We omit also the very numerous and decisive appeals in the

New Testament, to the Pentateuch as the work of Moses ; not because we doubt that they are conclusive in respect to the fact itself, for this all must admit, who regard the writers of the New Testament as under divine guidance in the composition of their works ; but because such an appeal would probably be one, the force of which Gesenius would not admit. In matters of criticism, he regards the apostles and prophets as erring in common with the age in which they lived. Setting aside, then, all that ground of appeal which he would dispute, we have appealed only to those writings which preceded the captivity, or were composed either during this event, or so near it, that the authors must have known whether the Pentateuch was a recent book. We are willing to risk the whole question on the appeals which have been made, if they may be judged of by the same rules, which critics every day apply to the decision of questions that have respect to the Greek and Roman classics, or any other ancient writings.

3. Justice, however, to this important subject, obliges us to add some other considerations in favour of the antiquity of the Pentateuch, which may be called *indirect* testimony.

With a few solitary exceptions, everything in the Pentateuch conspires to prove its antiquity. Its historical, religious, political, and geographical matter, is such as might be expected in a book of the age which is claimed for it. The Exodus of the Hebrews under Moses as a leader, is a fact that no one doubts ; and the history of this, during forty years of wandering around the Arabian desert, is such as might be expected. It has been alleged, as a very formidable objection against the authorship of Moses, that the whole of the Pentateuch is in a *fragmentary condition*, exhibiting the formulas appropriate to the beginnings and endings of different compositions by a variety of persons ; that it exhibits a variety of repetitions, both of laws and facts ; and a considerable number of discrepancies, which could not have proceeded from one and the same writer. But this argument is far from convincing us that Moses was not the author. In fact, when thoroughly examined, it serves very much to strengthen us in the opinion that he was. Moses was forty years, at least, in completing the Pentateuch. Nothing can be more improbable, therefore, than the supposition that he did, or could (occupied as he was) sit down and write the whole *continuously*, and agreeably to a plan previously arranged. His work, then, would necessarily contain a great many different compositions,

each of which would very naturally have some formula of commencement and conclusion. Nothing could be more accordant with the condition and circumstances of Moses than this.

Besides, there are most evident marks in the very nature of the composition, that much of it must have been written at the time when the facts, to which allusion is made, took place. For example, in the history of building the tabernacle (Exodus xxv—xxx), we are presented with a draft for the model of it. We must believe this was drawn by the hand of Moses; for chapters xxxvi—xl exhibit a minute record of the accomplishment of this work, which is only a counterpart of the draft. It is perfectly natural, now, to suppose that the draft was first written out by Moses, and then the accomplishment of the work, piece by piece, recorded by himself, or by some one appointed by him to superintend it; and thus came about so long a series of architectural description, and the repetition of it. But who can suppose that a writer, several centuries afterwards, would repeat an account of *such* matters, in this minute way? Or whence could he possibly have derived the knowledge requisite for such a description? Surely tradition could never have preserved minutiae, of such a nature as the compositions in question exhibit; above all, it could not have presented them in the same order and copiousness, and with the same repetitions, that are now exhibited in the passages just described.

We ask, further, whether such a census as is contained in Numbers i. and ii, also in Numbers xxxiv, could have been orally and traditionally preserved? Above all, is it possible that the number and order of the Levitical rites and ordinances could have been kept merely in memory? Could a service, so important as this was deemed by the author of the Pentateuch, be left to mere *oral* tradition for preservation, when the art of writing was already in use? Could a service so complex in its nature, consisting of such a countless number of particulars, and to be performed by so great a multitude of priests, have been left to chance and to evervarying tradition for its regulation? The code for the priests occupies no small part of the Pentateuch; and when we find that the Jewish sacrifices, in all the ages which succeeded Moses, appear to have had, and in fact must have had, some rules, to which appeals about the time and manner of offering them were made; some rules, for the neglect of which priests and people are charged with disobedience and a wayward spirit; can it be that there was, during all this time,

no code for the priests except what was preserved by mere *oral* report? The thing is altogether improbable.

But when it is averred, that repetitions of the same subject, additions made to laws, and changes made in them, imply that different and discrepant traditionary accounts were, in some later age, thrown together by some anonymous compiler of the Pentateuch, we must avow that a very different conviction arises in our minds, from the knowledge of facts like these. For example, the law respecting the passover is introduced in Exodus xii. 1—28; resumed Exodus xii. 43—51; again in chapter xiii; and once more, with supplements, in Numbers ix. 1—14. Would a compiler, after the exile, have scattered these notices of the passover in so many different places? Surely not; he would naturally have embodied all the traditions concerning it in one chapter. But now, everything wears the exact appearance of having been recorded in the order in which it happened. New exigencies occasioned new ordinances, and these are recorded, as they were made, *pro re natâ*.

In like manner, the code of the priests not having been finished at once in the book of Leviticus, the subject is resumed, and completed, at various times, and on various occasions, as is recorded in the subsequent books of the Pentateuch. So the subject of sin and trespass offerings is again and again resumed, until the whole arrangements are completed. Would not a later compiler have embodied these subjects respectively together?

Besides repeated instances of the kind just alluded to, cases occur, in which statutes made at one time are repealed or modified at another. We refer to such examples, as our readers may find in Exodus xxi. 2—7, compared with Deuteronomy xv. 12—17; Numbers iv. 24—33, compared with Numbers vii. 1—9; Numbers iv. 3, compared with Numbers viii. 24; Leviticus xvii. 3, 4, compared with Deuteronomy xi. 15; Exodus xxii. 25, compared with Deuteronomy xxiii. 19; Exodus xxii. 16, 17, compared with Deuteronomy xxii. 29; and other like instances. How could a compiler, at the time of the captivity, know anything of the original laws, in these cases, which had gone into desuetude from the time of Moses?

All these things, to which we have been adverting, so far from strengthening the cause of those who deny the early age of the Pentateuch, serve to show, in our apprehension, that it was written, as it purports to be, by the great Jewish legislator, at

different times, *pro re natâ*, and in many different parcels at first, which were afterwards united. That the union of these might have taken place near the death of Moses, or still later, is altogether possible ; nay, considering circumstances by and by to be mentioned, quite probable. That Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch with his own hand, need not be maintained ; for what difference can it make with the authenticity of the book, whether he wrote it all with his own hand ; or employed an amanuensis to whom he dictated it ; or made use of some compositions which were from the pens of others, reviewing them and adapting them to his purpose ? All late writers, who have critically examined the book of Genesis, concede the latter, in respect to that book. But by conceding this, neither the value of the book is diminished, nor its authority ; nor is the fact at all impugned that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch. What he may have taken from others, and adapted to his own purpose, and sanctioned with his authority, is to be ascribed to him in every sense (so far as the *authority* of religious truth is concerned) which is worth contending about. Moses is the *voucher* for all that has passed through his hands ; and that is sufficient.

4. In all the history of the Jews, throughout the Old Testament, whether it be found in the books which are merely historical, or adverted to in the prophets, there are laws, rules, and prescriptions referred to and implied, a departure from which lays the foundation of reproof ; and a compliance with which is matter of commendation. It will be admitted that the laws &c. adverted to, appear to be uniformly the *same*. Now can such a case be well supposed, unless the record of such laws and prescriptions was reduced to writing ?

5. Universal tradition, from the earliest ages down to the present hour, among Jews and Christians, ascribes the Pentateuch to Moses. The few critics who have in modern and recent times impugned this, are the only exception to be made to this statement. This argument is the same as that which satisfies us that Homer wrote the *Iliad* ; Hesiod, the *Theogony* ascribed to him ; Herodotus, the history which bears his name ; and Virgil, the *Æneid*. In our apprehension, there is as little of solid ground to call in question the genuineness of the Pentateuch, as of the heathen writings just mentioned.

We have merely touched on some of the leading topics of argument, in respect to this great subject. We must necessarily

pass by a multitude of minor considerations, which might be added to strengthen what has been said, and hasten to some brief remarks on the arguments which are urged against the antiquity of the Pentateuch.

All the arguments of this kind may be reduced to three classes; namely, those drawn from the diction or language of the Pentateuch; those deduced from the general style and conformation of it; and such as are derived from particular passages, which are said necessarily to imply an age later than that of Moses.

1. In regard to the language of the Pentateuch, it is averred that it is throughout substantially the same with that, which appears in the books composed five hundred or more years later, that is, at or after the time of David; nay, the same as is found one thousand years later, in the books written at the time of the exile. No nation, it is averred, ever preserved a uniformity in a living language, for so long a period. No example of such a nature can be produced. Consequently, the Pentateuch must have been written at a later period.

In respect to this argument, we have to reply, that conceding for the present the statement to be true, respecting the sameness of language in the Pentateuch and later Hebrew writings, yet there are not wanting facts of a similar nature, to show that this argument has little or no weight. For example, the old Syriac version of the New Testament, called the *Peshito*, made probably in the second century, differs very little in respect to language from the *Chronicon* of Bar Hebræus, written about one thousand years later. The language of the Koran, and of the Arabic just before and after the Koran was written, differs but slightly from that of the Arabic writers from the tenth down to the eighteenth century. So Rosenmueller and Jahn both assert; whom all will allow to be competent judges of this fact. And what is still more in point; Confucius, the celebrated Chinese philosopher, lived and wrote about five hundred and fifty years before Christ. Yet Dr Marshman, his translator, asserts, that there is very little difference between his diction, and that of the Chinese writers of the present day. One Chinese commentary, which Dr Marshman consulted, was written one thousand and five hundred years after the work of Confucius; and another, still later; and yet he tells us that he found no difference between the commentaries and the original, in respect to style and diction, excepting that the original was

more concise. Here then is a period of more than two thousand years, in which language has been preserved uniform. Such facts, in connexion with the well known aversion to changes among the oriental nations; and the consideration that the Hebrews were altogether a secluded people, having no commerce, and but little intercourse with foreigners, having no schools in philosophy, and making no advances in the arts and sciences, so as to create the necessity of introducing new words into their language—such facts would deprive the argument in question of all its power to convince, even if the assertion on which it is grounded were true.

But in this case, (as in many others, where the attractions of novelty have led men to make hasty and ungrounded conclusions,) the fact, upon examination, turns out to be altogether untrue. After it had been asserted, and repeated by the *neological* class of critics, in every part of the continent of Europe, the late Professor Jahn of Vienna undertook the investigation of it, by betaking himself to his Hebrew concordance, and looking the whole store of Hebrew words through and through, to find where and by whom they were employed. The result of this gigantic labor has been published, since his death, in two essays, printed in Bengel's *Archiv für die Theologie*, vol. ii. and iii. Two more essays in defence of the antiquity of the Pentateuch, the author had planned; but death interrupted his most valuable labors.

This writer has collected from the Pentateuch more than two hundred words, which are either not used at all in the other books; or are not used in the same sense; or have not the same form; or, if employed at all, are employed but in few instances, principally by the poets, who prefer the older diction. It would be out of place to give examples here, and we can only refer our readers to the work itself for ample satisfaction. To the class of words already named, the author has added a second class, still larger, of words frequently used in the later writings, and but seldom or not at all used in the Pentateuch. From the class of words so unexpectedly large, that are found to be peculiar to the Pentateuch, are excluded by Jahn, all proper names of persons, countries, cities, and nations; the names of various diseases and their symptoms, referred to in the Pentateuch; of defects in men, priests, and offerings in regard to ceremonial purity; the parts of offerings; and the objects in the three kingdoms of nature. Besides these, the multiplied

instances of peculiar phraseology are excluded. If all these had been *included*, he asserts it would have made the catalogue of peculiarities four or five times as large as he has now made it. Of this we doubt not. But enough is already done to put the question forever at rest, about the uniformity of the language of the Pentateuch with that of the later books. The labor of Jahn is one of those triumphant efforts, which patient and long continued investigation sometimes makes, to overthrow theories, which the love of novelty, reasoning *a priori*, or superficial investigation, ventures upon. Gesenius himself has not, in the work which we are reviewing, ventured on the argument against the early date of the Pentateuch, drawn from its language; but in an earlier work, his *History of the Hebrew Language*, he has appealed to this very argument as his main support; although his *Lexicon* itself, which points out the earlier and later usage of words among the Hebrews, sufficiently contradicts it.

It is gratifying to find that Rosenmueller, who, in the early editions of his commentary on the Pentateuch, appeared as a strenuous advocate for its late origin, has, in the *Prolegomena* to his third edition, attacked, and in our judgment overturned, the opinions, which in younger days he had broached. This shows a fairness of mind, which is promising, in respect to this learned critic. For the conviction, which led him to do this, he is plainly indebted to Jahn; as any one may satisfy himself, who will take the pains to compare the essays of Jahn with what he has written.

2. We hasten to the second source of objections against the antiquity of the Pentateuch, drawn from the general style and conformation of it.

Much that has been alleged here, we have already anticipated, under our third head of arguments in favor of the position, that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. All the various introductions and conclusions of different pieces in the Mosaic books, all the repetitions and minor discrepancies, so much insisted on as proof of later compilation, we consider a presumptive evidence in favor of its composition by Moses; inasmuch as they accord very exactly with the real circumstances in which he was placed, when he wrote the books that are ascribed to him.

In regard to the allegations made, that there is a great diversity of style in the Pentateuch; above all, that the book of Deuteronomy is exceedingly diverse from the three other books,

and betrays a later and a different hand ; and consequently the whole can never be ascribed to Moses as the author ; we confess ourselves not to be much moved by allegations of this nature. De Wette, Vater, Gesenius, and other critics aver indeed, that the style of Deuteronomy is widely different from that of the other Mosaic books ; but Eichhorn, Eckermann, Herder, and many others of those who are called the most liberal critics, aver that the same style is everywhere to be met with in the last book of Moses, as in the others. *De gustibus non disputandum.* We may add, *A gustibus non argumentandum.* The subjective feelings of men, in regard to matters of this kind, are exceedingly liable to be guided by their previous intellectual views. Such is actually the fact, in regard to a multitude of cases, which every one at all conversant with the history of literature and criticism knows. Most abundantly satisfied we are, that the mere judgment of a modern occidental man, depending on his taste and fine perception of oriental and Hebrew niceties of style, is not to come in competition with *facts*, such as have already been adduced.

One amusing instance of criticism of this sort we will stop to relate ; as it may serve to aid what we are endeavoring to enforce in respect to our subject. Every tyro in criticism knows something of the celebrated Wolf, at Berlin ; and that he published very long and learned *Prolegomena* upon Homer, in which he labored to show, that the Iliad and Odyssey are, to an extent even unknown, spurious productions. The whole classical world has been obscured, by the smoke and dust which he has raised. The same Wolf, in his edition of some of Cicero's orations, says, (p. 4 and 7 of the Introduction to the Oration for Marcellus,) '*Quatuor orationibus Ciceronianum nomen detraxi. . . . Adeo mihi in oratione pro Marcello certa et perspicua videbantur inesse indicia volucrias, et mirificus error, per tot sæcula propagatus, plane et evidenter convinci posse.*' Just so De Wette and Vater speak respecting the Pentateuch. But Weiske, in his *Commentarius perpetuus et plenus in Orationem pro Marcello*, p. 5, seq. has taken the very same grounds, which Wolf has rested upon in order to impeach the genuineness of this oration, and applied them to prove that Wolf did not write the criticism which he has published ; and with complete effect.

How much now can be made of such confident judgments, formed merely by subjective taste ? Above all, can they be

relied on, when they overturn the established and uniform opinion of all preceding ages?

In our apprehension, there is a difference between the style of Deuteronomy and of the preceding books, like to that existing between the style of John's epistles and of his gospel. Old age is diffuse and affectionate. Both these traits are strongly marked in Deuteronomy, and in John's epistles. The case is different with the preceding books of the Pentateuch, and with the gospel of John. More than this cannot well be proved. Jahn has shown, that with the exception of a small portion at the end of the book, Deuteronomy has all the archaisms and peculiarities of the Mosaic writings.

3. The third class of objections it would take a moderate volume to discuss *seriatim*. We shall therefore choose only two or three topics, which exhibit a principle of reasoning that may be applied to all the particular cases.

The principal objections adduced by Gesenius, in the work which we are reviewing, against the antiquity of the Pentateuch, are founded on the principle, that many passages in it, particularly in the book of Deuteronomy, betray an exact knowledge of facts that happened in later ages. The argument is this; Moses could not have a definite knowledge of such facts, and consequently Moses did not write the passages in question, but some person who lived after the events described had taken place, or when they were apparently about to take place. He appeals for proof of this to Genesis xlix, as containing a graphic account of the fate and fortune of the twelve tribes; to Genesis xlviii. 8, seq. which exhibits similar matter, as also does Deuteronomy xxxiii. 1. He appeals to the threatenings in Leviticus xxvi, which, he says, are obviously such as the prophets were accustomed to utter in later ages, just before the events threatened took place. The same objection he makes to Deuteronomy xxxiii. The dispersion of the Jews, threatened in Deuteronomy iv. 27, 28, and xxviii. 25, 36, seq. he thinks must have been written after the event had commenced; and the law respecting false prophets, in Deuteronomy xiii. 1, and xviii. 20, must have been occasioned by the existence of them, which was long after the time of Moses.

All this, it is easy to perceive, turns on one single point, namely, whether Moses could and did possess a prophetic spirit, or the power of predicting events that were future. We believe that it is possible for the God who made men, to endow them

with such a spirit. On the testimony of Jesus and his apostles (not to mention other reasons which we have), we believe in the fact that Moses did possess this spirit. Now as it is plainly impossible to prove that he did not possess it, much more so that he could not possess it, any argument, built on the assumption that a knowledge of future events supernaturally communicated is an impossibility, can never be a valid argument against the early existence of a book which implies such a knowledge in the author. The question, whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not, is simply a *historical* one; and it cannot therefore depend on a philosophical maxim, which is founded on mere *à priori* principles of reasoning. The same argument which Gesenius here uses to disprove the antiquity of the Pentateuch, would disprove the existence of real prediction in any part of the Scriptures. We hesitate not to avow, that we can never be convinced by an argument which extends so far as this.

In the same strain of argument, our author alleges that Exodus xv. 13, 17, alludes to Jerusalem as a stated place of worship, and therefore the song in this chapter must have been composed after the events to which it alludes had taken place. This, if the nature of the argument were valid, depends on an interpretation of the passage which we regard as quite unnecessary, and in fact indefensible.

Such is the substance of the objections alleged by Gesenius against the antiquity of the Hebrew Pentateuch, and which go to prove, as he declares, that it must have been composed later at least than the time of Solomon.

Others have drawn out at great length all the particular passages, which necessarily imply, as they allege, a late composition of the books in question. For example; there are several passages where the ancient name of a town is mentioned, and then a later name is added. As an instance; in Genesis xiv. 7, the name Bela occurs, after which it is added, 'the same is Zoar.' So Genesis xiv. 7, 17. xxiii. 19. xxxv. 19. xlviii. 7. Deuteronomy iv. 48. There are some passages, too, where a more modern name occurs simply; as Hebron, in Genesis xiii. 18, compare Joshua xiv. 15. xv. 13. So Dan, in Genesis xiv. 14. Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1, compare Joshua xix. 47. Judges xviii. 29.

We very readily concede the point, that a few glosses of this nature, explanatory of more ancient geography, were added to the Pentateuch by later writers, in order to make it more intelligible to the men of their times. But the fact, that these glosses

stand so in relief, as it respects the original text, that a critic cannot well hesitate where they begin and where they end, is so far from being a proof that the whole books of Moses were composed in a later age, that it is manifestly a proof to the contrary. How could a late writer scarcely ever betray the age in which he lived? How could it be, that he should introduce no foreign terms into his work but such as are Egyptian, in the midst of all the intercourse which the later ages had with the nations of the north and the east? Questions difficult to be answered; and which have never been answered to our satisfaction, by any who oppose the antiquity of the Pentateuch.

We conclude this protracted part of our discussion, by a few remarks on the usual method of treating our subject.

The advocates for the antiquity of the Pentateuch have not unfrequently made such extravagant claims for the genuineness of every part of it, even the minutest, that they have unwarily contributed, in no small degree, to aid the assaults of their opponents. Will any man believe, for example, that Moses wrote the account of his own death and burial, which is placed at the end of the Pentateuch? May it not be conceded as probable, that the long genealogy of the kings of Edom, in Genesis xxxvi. was completed by some later hand? And when 'the man Moses' is described as 'meek beyond all others,' may not some other hand than his own have added this? Such high claims, which can never be rendered valid, nor shown to be reasonable, only serve to expose a good cause to the assaults of those who oppugn it. If they can triumph over one and another argument, which want of acquaintance with the subject, or superstition, or excessive views about the kind of perfection attached to the Scriptures have led men to use; they are very prone to carry an analogy forward, and extend it to all the arguments which are employed for the purpose of defence. The time has come, indeed, when men must know with what sort of arms they are contending. Every principle, in this age of free inquiry, will be probed to the very bottom; and if it will not abide the trial, it will be cast away. Sooner or later, it must come to this. We profess to be among those who believe, that the sooner this takes place, the better for the cause of truth, of the Scriptures, and the interests of true religion in the world.

If we have succeeded in showing that the Hebrew Pentateuch, as to all its essential parts, came from the hand of Moses, we have of course prepared the way to show the possibility, that

the Samaritan Pentateuch may be older than the time of the Babylonish exile.

We must limit ourselves to the leading topics of argument ; which we shall aim to state simply, without particular reference to all that has been written in regard to this subject.

It is important, in order to prepare the mind for a proper view of this topic, to take a brief survey of the condition and circumstances of the ten tribes, from whom the Samaritans originated, or whom, we may perhaps more properly say, they succeeded.

In the year 975 before Christ, ten tribes, under Jeroboam, revolted from the dominion of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, and erected a separate principality. This continued, with some intervals of anarchy and confusion, for the space of two hundred and fiftythree years ; when the country was invaded by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and all the people of wealth, influence, and consideration, were deported to the provinces of Halah and Habor by the river Gozan, and to the cities of the Medes, 2 Kings xvii. 6. The succession of kings from Jeroboam downwards, may be exhibited to view in a short compass.

	A. C.		A. C.
Jeroboam	975	Jeroboam II.	825
Nadab	954	(Interregnum)	784
Baasha	952	Zachariah	773
Elah	930	Shallum	773
Omri	929	Menahem	773
Ahab	918	Pekahiah	761
Ahaziah	897	Pekah	759
Joram	896	(Interregnum)	740
Jehu	884	Hoshea	731
Jehoahaz	856	(Captivity)	722
Jehoash	840		

Most of these kings were more or less devoted to idolatry, or at least to *moscholatry*, that is, the worship of the golden calves set up by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel, towns near the two extremities of his kingdom. This was, no doubt, like the worship that was practised in Egypt of the god Apis ; for Jeroboam had lived in Egypt, previously to his becoming a king, 1 Kings xii. 2. It would seem, however, that the design of Jeroboam was rather to worship Jehovah, under the symbol of the calves, than absolutely to proscribe all the religious worship due to him. It was Ahab, who first introduced the worship of foreign idols in a manner fully heathen, 2 Kings xvi. 30—33. He persecuted

and destroyed the prophets of the true God, and oppressed and terrified all who worshipped him. This did many of the succeeding kings, in a greater or less degree ; but none, with the zeal and bitterness of Ahab, who was instigated by a heathenish wife, both bigoted and bloodthirsty. But during the reign of all the Israelitish kings, there were more or less true prophets and worshippers of the true God among the ten tribes. This is a very interesting fact ; and it has a bearing so important on the subject of the present discussion, that some delay is proper, in order to establish it.

In the time of Jeroboam, the first king of Israel, we find the prophet Ahijah exercising his office among the ten tribes. Under Nadab, Jehu the son of Hanani was prophet ; under Ahab, Elijah and Micaiah the son of Imlah ; under Ahaziah, Elijah, Elisha, and Micaiah ; under Joram, Elisha ; under Jehu, Elisha and another prophet sent by him to anoint Jehu. In the time of Elijah and Elisha, there was a school of the prophets also at Bethel, 2 Kings ii. 3. Jehoahaz king of Israel sought the Lord, in the time of Elisha, and was promised victory over the Syrians his enemies ; as did also Joash, his successor. Jeroboam the Second not only obtained a victory over the Syrians, according to the prediction of Josiah the son of Amittai, but extended his conquests so as to recover the dominions that had been lost, under Jehu and Jehoahaz. Under the reign of Jeroboam the second, Hosea and Amos, prophets whose works are a part of our Scripture canon, lived among the ten tribes, and prophesied concerning them. During the short and interrupted reigns which followed, there may have been, and probably were, prophets of the Lord among the ten tribes, although we have no express account of them. It is plainly intimated, however, in 2 Kings xvii. 13, that God did not cease to warn Israel, as well as Judah, by prophets and seers, down to the time of their captivity.

On the supposition now that the law of Moses was already in existence (as we have seen it probably was), during all the period in which the ten tribes had a separate national standing, and that so many true prophets lived among them, and were commissioned to instruct and reprove them ; can it be rationally supposed, that these prophets had no copy of the Pentateuch, no standard to which they made the appeal in all cases of command and reproof? Were Elijah, and Elisha, and Hosea, and Amos, unacquainted with the law of Moses? Read the

works of the two latter prophets, and see if the appeal to the Pentateuch is not too often made, for any one reasonably to doubt of its existence, and of their acquaintance with it, in its present form.

But this is not all. The people among the ten tribes were never all of them devoted to idol worship. In the time of Asa king of Judah, about nine hundred and fortyone years before Christ, a great reformation was effected, and the worship of God renewed with zeal, among the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. With the devout worshippers from these tribes, great numbers out of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and Simeon, that is, out of the ten tribes, were associated, 2 Chronicles xiv. 8, seq. Under Ahab, the most zealous and oppressive of all the idolatrous kings of Israel, when even Elijah the prophet thought that he alone was left, of all the nation, who worshipped the true God, the divine response informed him that seven thousand remained in Israel, who had not bowed the knee to Baal, 1 Kings xix. 10, 18.

Hezekiah king of Judah wrote letters of invitation to Ephraim and Manasseh, to come and keep the passover with him and his people, 2 Chronicles xxx. 1 ; and although most of the people among these tribes derided the proposal, yet not a few of them accepted the invitation, 2 Chronicles xxx. 11. Josiah carried reform still further ; for he went through the land of Israel, and destroyed all their idols and altars, 2 Chronicles xxxiv. 6, seq. That he did this with the approbation of very many among the ten tribes, may be inferred from the fact, that no war appears to have taken place in consequence of this proceeding.

Such are the numerous and unquestionable evidences, that the worship of the true God was kept up, in some form more or less perfect, among the ten tribes, during the whole of their existence as a separate nation. Now could this have been done without some rule ; some uniform basis or support ; some paramount authority to which the prophets all made an appeal, in order to enforce their reproofs, and sanction their precepts ? To say the least, such would be a case extremely rare of occurrence ; indeed, a case altogether improbable.

The ten tribes, then, were in possession of the law of Moses. Such is the conclusion to which facts like these necessarily bring us.

Besides, how happens it that the Samaritans, descended from them, have never possessed or acknowledged any other

of the Old Testament Scriptures, except the Pentateuch? Must it not have been for the reason, that when they received the Pentateuch, it was then the only part of the Hebrew Scriptures which was in common circulation among the Jews? If so, then they must have very early been in possession of it; for the writings of David and Solomon were already in existence, and if the ten tribes came in possession of the Pentateuch after these writings began to circulate, why did they not receive these Scriptures as well as the other?

Gesenius has adverted to this argument, in the work before us, page 4. His reply is, that the writings of David, Solomon, and the prophets who succeeded them, everywhere acknowledge Jerusalem and the temple there, as the seat and only proper place of sacred solemnities. This the ten tribes, of course, would not acknowledge; and therefore they rejected all the books, that is, the works of David, Solomon &c. which contained such acknowledgments.

But even if this be allowed, the reply is insufficient. The books of Joshua and Judges contain nothing of any such references to the preeminence of Jerusalem, and of the worship established there; nothing of the preeminence of the tribe of Judah; in short, nothing which would interfere with the peculiar views of the ten tribes about the place of worship. Now as these books, for substance, are confessedly of early composition, why should the Pentateuch be received among the ten tribes, or the Samaritans, and these be rejected, unless the reception of the Pentateuch among them took place at a time which preceded the circulation of the books in question among the Hebrews in general? The reason alleged by Gesenius proves too much; for if it be valid, then we might confidently expect to find the books of Joshua and Judges included in the canon of the Samaritans. The reason for rejecting particular books from the canon, which he assigns, does not apply to the books in question.

Besides, there is somewhat of ὑστέρων πρότερον in the argument which the learned critic adduces. Where does he find, in the history of the ten tribes, any dispute about the place of worship? Surely it cannot be forgotten, that the question about mount Gerizim arose years after the return from the Babylonish exile. Jeroboam, indeed, established the worship of the golden calves at Dan and Bethel, the two extremities of his kingdom; but where does it appear, that the ten tribes attached any pe-

culiar notions of value to these places, so that Jerusalem and Zion would have excited particular jealousy in their minds? The jealousies between the ten tribes and the two tribes, were of a civil and political, rather than of a religious cast. Who does not know that Judah and Benjamin, with their kings, fell into idolatry almost as often as the Israelites? Solomon began it, near the close of his life, 1 Kings xi. 7, seq. Rehoboam his successor followed his example, 2 Chronicles xii. 1, 14; as did Jehoram, 2 Chronicles xxi. 6; Ahaziah, 2 Chronicles xxii. 3; Ahaz, 2 Chronicles xxviii. 6; Manasseh, 2 Chronicles xxxiii. 2; Jehoiakim, 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 5; Jehoiachin, 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 9; and Zedekiah, 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 12. It was not, then, because the ten tribes were wholly devoted to idol worship (we have already seen this was not the case) and Judah wholly devoted to the worship of the true God, that enmity existed between them. They often harmonized in their objects of worship. The early enmity between these rival kingdoms, was plainly of a *civil*, not of a religious nature; a circumstance that seems to have been almost wholly overlooked, as yet, among critics who have assailed, or who have defended, the antiquity of the Samaritan Pentateuch. If we are correct, religious sympathies among the ten tribes are not to be adduced as an argument on which reliance can be placed, either in respect to the reception or rejection of any part of the Hebrew Scriptures. Two of their prophets, Hosea and Amos, are among the number of our canonical writers. Yet the Samaritans do not acknowledge them, and the Jews do acknowledge them. This only serves to show how much farther the argument, drawn from the religious sympathies of these two parties in very ancient times, has been carried, than can be justified by the facts which are before us. It was the occurrence that took place after the return of the Jews from their exile, and which is related in Ezra iv, that first gave rise to high religious antipathy between the Jews and the Samaritans; which was, however, exceedingly aggravated, when the Samaritans erected a rival temple on mount Gerizim, and claimed that place as the proper scriptural one, for the celebration of their religious solemnities.

Gesenius asks, How could Jeroboam possibly venture on idol worship at Dan and Bethel, and how could he have dared to dispossess the Levites of their rights, in case the Pentateuch had been in the hands of his people, which so plainly and di-

rectly forbids all this? But this proves too much also. Let us put it to the test. How could the Jews, during the very process of legislation at mount Sinai, and after the ten commandments had been published, make the golden calf and worship it? How could Solomon, and Ahaz, and Manasseh, and other Jewish kings, practise idol worship, when the same commands were extant among them in writing, as Gesenius himself would allow? So plain is it, that we never can argue from the practice of a corrupt and wicked people, to prove the nonexistence of a law among them forbidding their evil deeds. Might we not now prove, by the same process of argument, that the gospel does not at all exist in Christian lands?

The Pentateuch then may have existed, and it is altogether probable, in our view, that it did exist in writing, among the ten tribes. Let us follow its history down among the Samaritans.

After the deportation of the principal men among the ten tribes into a foreign land, by Shalmaneser king of Assyria, 2 Kings xvii, many heathen from the provinces of the Assyrian empire were sent, in their room, into the land of Israel, 2 Kings xvii. 24. These served not Jehovah; and he visited them with the ravages of lions. Terrified by this, they applied to the king of Assyria for counsel; who sent them a priest (one that had been carried away as a captive from Samaria) to 'teach them how they should fear Jehovah,' 2 Kings xvii. 28. At the same time they, still continued their idol worship; merely counting Jehovah as one of the gods to whom they paid their devotions, 2 Kings xvii. 32, seq.

It was at this period, that the name of *Samaritans* appears to have been given to this mixed people, composed of heathen and the lower classes of the ten tribes not carried away by Shalmaneser. This name first occurs in 2 Kings xvii. 29, and is derived from Samaria, the customary place of royal residence for the Israelitish kings. Omri, the father of Ahab, first built the city of Samaria, on a parcel of ground which he purchased of Shemer (שֶׁמֶר), and surnamed it after the original owner, שְׁמֶרֹן *Shomerōn*, that is, Samaria.

We hear nothing more of the Samaritans, for one hundred and eightyseven years after this, when the Jews, returned from their exile, began to rebuild their temple. On this occasion, the Samaritans offered to assist them, alleging that they sought God in the same manner as the Jews, and were accustomed to sacrifice to him, from the time that the king of Assyria had

brought them into the land. The Jews, however, rejected their proposal, Ezra iv. 3, 4. Embittered by this, the Samaritans sought in various ways to hinder the building of the temple; and did, in fact, for a long time, delay the completion of it.

In the time of Nehemiah, about four hundred and eight years before Christ, Manasseh, a son of the high priest Jojada at Jerusalem, married a daughter of Sanballat the governor of Samaria, and was, on this account, exiled by his brother Jaddus, who was high priest at the time of this occurrence. Manasseh went over to his father in law, carrying along with him a party of Jews, who had married foreign wives, and had thus become obnoxious among their countrymen at home. Sanballat took advantage of this occurrence, and built a temple for his son in law, on mount Gerizim; which became an object of jealousy and bitter hatred, on the part of the Jews. About two hundred years afterwards, this temple was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, Josephus' *Antiquities*, xiii. 18. The place, however, remained sacred in the view of the Samaritans, even down to the time of our Saviour, John iv. 19, seq.

The Samaritans are frequently mentioned in the works of the Christian Fathers; but we know little of the particulars of their history, since they ceased to be a nation. As a religious sect, they exist to the present hour, and Sichem is, and has always been, their central point. There they have preserved a copy of the Mosaic law; and also a supposititious book of Joshua, so mutilated as scarcely to bear a perceptible relation to the true one.

From this brief view of the Samaritans, it appears highly probable that they have ever continued to possess copies of the Pentateuch, even from the time of Jeroboam; and that it is not without some good reason that critics, such as Eichhorn and others, have argued for the great antiquity of the Hebrew Pentateuch, from the antiquity of the Samaritan copy of it.

We have dwelt so long on the question respecting the antiquity of the Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuch, because it is a very important one in regard to the literature of our sacred books; not to say almost an essential one, in respect to the authenticity of the five books of Moses. It is a question, too, which has deeply agitated critics on the continent of Europe, and which has been contested with great ability and learning, and not a little excitement of feeling. Hobbes, in his *Leviathan*, was the first in modern times, we believe, who ventured to assail the genuineness of the Pentateuch,

maintaining that these books are called *the Books of Moses*, because they have respect to him, and not because he was the author of them. After him, Peyrerius, Spinoza, Simon, Le Clerc in early life, Hasse, Fulda, Nachtigal, Bertholdt, and Volney, in various ways, called in question or denied the genuineness of the Pentateuch. But the most potent adversaries who have contended against it, are De Wette, Vater, and Gesenius, all still living. The two former have gone into the subject at great length, (De Wette in his *Beiträge &c.*, and Vater in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*), and collected together everything of importance that has been urged on this subject, and presented it in its strongest light. Vater has, on the whole, treated the subject with more discrimination and fulness, than any of the numerous opponents, who have in recent times risen up against the genuineness of the Pentateuch.

On the other hand, critics (liberal and orthodox, so called) have united their efforts in defence of its genuineness. Michaelis, Jahn, Steudlin, Eichhorn, Eckermann, Kelle, Rosenmueller, and others, have repelled the attacks which have been made. In particular, the last efforts of Jahn, to which a reference has already been made, have produced, we believe, a kind of cessation of hostilities, and an apparent doubt in the minds of assailants, whether the attack is to be renewed.

We have some other considerations, of a nature deeply interesting to sacred criticism, with respect to the Samaritan Pentateuch, which we cannot persuade ourselves to pass over in silence. All who are conversant with the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch, must know, that although, considered in a general point of view, it is a good version of the Hebrew, yet in very many cases it departs from the exactness of the original text. In regard to these departures, there is one circumstance of a very interesting nature; which is, that in more than a thousand cases of them, the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch are harmonious, both differing from the Hebrew, and agreeing in their differences. In most of these cases, the discrepancies with the original Hebrew are peculiar to the Samaritan and Septuagint codices alone, the ancient versions being only now and then accordant with them. The departures from the Hebrew, in the Septuagint and Samaritan, are thus classified by Gesenius, in the work which we are reviewing.

1. Those which are mere glosses or conjectural emendations of difficult passages. For example, Genesis ii. 2, 24. xiv. 19. xv. 21. xvii. 14 &c.

2. Very minute changes, not affecting the sense, and depending on the omission, transposition, or permutation of letters, &c. For example, *Vav* prefix is added, in the Samaritan, to the text about two hundred times, where it is not found in the Hebrew copy, and removed about one hundred times, where it is found in the Hebrew; in nearly all of which cases, it is closely followed by the Septuagint.

On the other hand, 3. The Septuagint agrees with the Hebrew, in cases like No. 2, in almost a thousand instances, where the Samaritan differs from both. For example, Genesis xvii. 17. xxi. 2, 4. xxiv. 55. xli. 32 &c. 4. Both the Samaritan and Septuagint sometimes depart from the Hebrew, in labouring to remove difficulties; but they pursue different courses, in order to accomplish this. For example, Genesis xxvii. 40. Exodus xxiv. 10, 11, and the genealogies in Genesis v. and xi. 5. The Septuagint accords with the Hebrew, and differs from the Samaritan, in all those daring interpolations, mentioned under the eighth class of various readings, in the former part of this review. 6. The Septuagint differs from the Hebrew and Samaritan both, in a few cases of minor importance, depending on transposition and permutation of letters, &c. or the introduction of parallel passages.

Castell has displayed all these discrepancies, in the sixth volume of Walton's *Polyglott*, page 19, seq. In regard to most of the cases, in which the Septuagint and Samaritan agree when they differ from the Hebrew, it is perfectly plain that this could not have been the result of any concerted regular plan of alteration, such as we see in the Samaritan and Septuagint, in respect to the chronologies in Genesis v. and xi. Most of the discrepancies in question are entirely of an immaterial nature, not at all affecting the sentiment of the sacred text.

Such are the *facts*. But a more difficult question remains. How are these facts to be accounted for? A question that leads to some considerations, which, to hinder any one from taking alarm, demand a good degree of acquaintance with the business of criticism.

Three ways have been proposed, to account for such a surprising accordance of the Septuagint and Samaritan, in so great a number of cases, against the Hebrew.

I. *The Seventy translated from a Samaritan Codex.* So L. de Dieu, Selden, Hottinger, Hassencamp, Eichhorn, and others. But this is altogether improbable. The mortal hatred,

which existed between the Jews and Samaritans in Palestine, at the time when the version of the Seventy was made, extended in the same manner to the Jews and Samaritans in Egypt. Josephus tells us, that in the time of the Ptolemies (therefore at or near the time when the Septuagint version was made), the Jews and Samaritans disputed violently before the Egyptian king; and that the Samaritans, who were worsted in the dispute, were condemned to death, *Antiquities*, xiii. 6. But Hassencamp and others labor to show, that many of the departures in the Septuagint from the Hebrew text, can more easily be accounted for, by the supposition that they used a manuscript written in the Samaritan character; inasmuch as the similar letters in this character might easily lead them into the mistakes which they have made in their versions, while the Hebrew square character, which has different similar letters, would not thus mislead them. It is unnecessary now to relate what former critics have replied, in answer to these and all such arguments depending on the forms of Hebrew letters. Since Hassencamp and Eichhorn defended the above position, and since Gesenius replied to them, in the essay before us, Kopp has published his *Bilder und Schriften der Vorzeit*, which contains an essay on Shemitish palæography, that bids fair to end all disputes about the ancient forms of Hebrew letters. Instead of tracing back the square character to Ezra, and to Chaldea, as nearly all the writers before him, not excepting Gesenius himself, had done, he has shown by matter of fact, by appeal to actually existing monuments, that the square character had no existence until many years, probably two or three centuries, after the Christian era commenced; and that it was, like the altered forms in most other alphabets, a gradual work of time, of calligraphy, or tachygraphy. He has exhibited the gradual formation of it, from the earliest monuments found on the bricks at Babylon, down through the Phœnician, the old Hebrew and Samaritan inscriptions enstamped on the Maccabæan coins, and the older and more recent Palmyrene or Syriac characters, to the modern Hebrew. The reasoning employed by him, and the facts exhibited, are so convincing, that Gesenius himself, in the last edition of his Hebrew Grammar, has yielded the point, and concedes that the square character of the Hebrew is descended from the Palmyrene, that is, such characters as are found in the inscriptions upon some of the ruins at Palmyra.

All argument from this source, then, is fairly put out of ques-

tion, by the masterly performance of Kopp, to which we have just adverted.

As the Septuagint is well known, and universally acknowledged, to be a version made by Jews, for their own use at Alexandria, there cannot be even a remote probability, that this version was made from a copy in the hands of Samaritans, whom they abhorred as the perverters of the Jewish religion.

II. *The Septuagint has been interpolated from the Samaritan Codex ; or the Samaritan from the Septuagint.*

Not the first ; for the Jews certainly never loved the Samaritans sufficiently well, to alter their Greek Scriptures from the Samaritan codex, so as to make them at the same time discrepant from their Hebrew codex.

Not the second ; for the Samaritans would have been as averse to amending their own codex from a Jewish Greek translation, as the Jews would have been to translate from the Samaritan codex. Besides, the greatest part of the discrepancies between the Samaritan and the Hebrew, are of such a nature as never could have proceeded from any design ; inasmuch as they make no change at all in the sense of the passages where they are found. Although, then, critics of no less name than Grotius, Usher, and Ravius, have patronised this opinion, it is too improbable to meet with approbation.

III. Another supposition, in order to account for the agreement of the Septuagint and Samaritan, and their departures from the Hebrew text, has been made by Gesenius, in the essay before us. This is, *that both the Samaritan and Septuagint flowed from a common recension of the Hebrew Scriptures ; one older of course than either, and differing in many places from the recension of the Masorites, now in common use.*

This is certainly a very ingenious supposition ; and one which we cannot well avoid admitting as quite probable. It will account for the differences, and for the agreements, of the Septuagint and Samaritan. On the supposition that two different recensions had long been in circulation among the Jews, the one of which was substantially what the Samaritan now is, with the exception of a few more recent and designed alterations of the text, and the other substantially what our Masoretic codex now is ; then the Seventy, using the former, would of course accord, in a multitude of cases, with the peculiar readings of it, as they have now done. If we suppose now, that the ancient copy from which the present Samaritan is descended, and that from which the Septua-

gint was translated, were of the same genus, so to speak, or of the same class, and yet were of different species under that genus, and had early been divided off, and subjected to alterations in transcribing ; then we may have a plausible reason, why the Septuagint, agreeing with the Samaritan in so many places, should differ from it in so many others. Add to this, that the Samaritan and Septuagint each, in the course being of transcribed for several centuries, would receive more or less changes, that might increase the discrepancies between them.

This seems to be the only probable way, in which the actual state of the Samaritan and Septuagint texts, compared with each other, and with the Hebrew, can be critically accounted for. Admitting this, therefore, with Gesenius, to be a highly probable account of this matter, we should say further, that the admission of it requires a different view of the antiquity of the Samaritan codex, from that which he has taken. If the Pentateuch was first reduced to writing about the time of the Babylonish exile, then there remains not sufficient time for the numerous changes to have taken place, by which the various recensions in question should come to differ so much from each other. Gesenius fixes upon the time, when Manasseh the son of the high priest at Jerusalem went over to the Samaritans and built a temple on Gerizim, as the most probable date for the origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch. This time, he seems to admit, was during the life of Darius Codomannus (as Josephus states, *Antiq.* xi. 7, § 2, 3, 4, 6), and of Alexander the Great, that is, near three hundred and thirty years before Christ. Now the version of the Septuagint was made about two hundred and eighty years before Christ, so that only half a century, according to him, elapsed between the two events in question ; a time not sufficient to produce much change in manuscripts. Even if we go back to the beginning of the exile, as the time when the Hebrew codex of the Pentateuch first originated (about five hundred and eighty-eight years before Christ,) we shall find it to be only two hundred and fifty-eight years from that period down to the time when the Samaritan copy, according to Gesenius, was probably made. If we suppose, with Prideaux and Jahn, that the apostasy of Manasseh took place a century earlier (a supposition, which Jahn has nearly demonstrated to be true, *Archæol. Theil* ii. § 63), then only one hundred and fifty years are left for all the changes in question to have taken place, by which the Samaritan codex is made so often to differ from the Hebrew. In any way of calculation, the origin of the

Pentateuch must be placed higher than Gesenius has placed it ; for the history of manuscripts will not justify the supposition, that changes so numerous, and undesigned (as he admits most of them to be), could have taken place in so short a period ; or that the various recensions of the Hebrew text could have differed so much, in so short a time, by the ordinary process of copying for circulation.

But we are aware, that we are now treading on sacred ground. If our suggestions are well founded, then must it follow, that in the time of Ezra, and previously to his time, there existed recensions of the Jewish Scriptures, which differed, in some respects, very considerably from each other. From this conclusion many will spontaneously revolt. All, who have not made sacred criticism a study, will be agitated with some unnecessary and ill grounded fears. For ourselves, we are fully convinced, first, that the position can be rendered highly probable ; and next, that it is no more dangerous than many other positions, which all enlightened critics of the present day admit.

It is probable ; because, as we have already endeavored to show, the actual state of the Septuagint and Samaritan Codices renders it necessary to admit the position. Moreover, the Jews have, from the most ancient times, uniformly held a tradition, that Ezra with his associates, whom they style the great Synagogue, restored the law and the prophets, that is, renewed and corrected the copies of them, which had become erroneous during the captivity. Certainly there is nothing at all improbable in this tradition. The corrected copies were the originals, probably, of our present Masoretic recension, which has in every age been in the keeping and under the inspection of the most learned Jews. The Samaritan copy, and that from which the Septuagint was translated, most probably belonged to the recension in common use among the Jews, and which, having been often copied and by unskilful hands, had come to differ in very many places from the corrected recension of Ezra.

How far back some of the errors in this common recension may be dated, it is difficult to say ; but in all probability more or less of them must be traced even to the very first copies taken from the original autographs. Such we know to have been the case, as is now universally admitted, in respect to the early copies of the New Testament. Is the Old Testament under a more watchful and efficient Providence than the New ? Or has it ever been so ? Nothing but the belief of a miraculous aid,

imparted to every copyist of the Hebrew Scriptures, can stand in the way of admitting the fact as we have stated it ; and with such a belief, after several hundred thousand different readings have been actually selected from the manuscripts of the Old Testament, it would not be worth our while to expostulate.

In justice, however, to this subject, and to allay the fears of well meaning men, who are not experienced in matters of criticism, and therefore often exposed to be agitated with groundless fears, we must say a few words with respect to the dangers of the position that has been now discussed.

A great part of it is evidently imaginary. For out of some eight hundred thousand various readings, about seven hundred and ninety-nine thousand are of just about as much importance to the sense of the Hebrew Scriptures, as the question in English orthography is, whether the word *honour* shall be spelled with *u* or without it. Of the remainder, some change the sense of particular passages or expressions ; or omit particular words and phrases ; or insert them ; but not one doctrine of religion is changed ; not one precept is taken away ; not one important fact is altered, by the whole of the various readings collectively taken. This is clearly the case, in respect to the various readings which are found in the Samaritan and Septuagint, if we except the very few cases of alterations in them, which plainly are the result of design, and which belong to more modern times. There is no ground then to fear for the safety of the Scriptures, on account of any legitimate criticism to which the text may be subjected. The common law has a maxim, which is the result of common sense, and must ever be approved by it ; which is, *De minimis non curat lex*. Another maxim too it has, equally applicable to the subject before us, namely, *Qui hæret in literâ, hæret in cortice*. All those, who suppose that the Scripture depends on a word or a letter, so essentially that it is not Scripture if either be changed or omitted, must, if they will be consistent, abandon the whole Bible, in which many changes of this kind, it is past all question, have actually taken place. The critic wonders not that so many have taken place, but that no more have been experienced.

It is sometimes said, that ‘ he who knows nothing, fears nothing.’ We believe this is occasionally true. But we apprehend the proverb would have come much nearer to a true statement of what usually happens, if it had been thus ; ‘ he who knows nothing, fears every thing.’ In innumerable cases do we see

this verified. It is quite applicable to the subject of various readings in the Scriptures. The first attempt to compare manuscripts and collect these readings, was denounced as something horribly profane and dangerous. Yet the comparison went on. Next, it was admitted to be right in respect to the New Testament, but very wrong in regard to the Old ; every word, and letter, and vowel point, and accent of which, Buxtorf roundly asserted, are identically the same, all the world over. More than eight hundred thousand various readings actually collected have dissipated this illusion, and taught how groundless the fears of those were, who were altogether inexperienced in the criticism of the sacred text. Do Christians love and honor the Bible or its contents less now, than before the age of criticism ? Let the present attitude of the Christian world answer this question.

Jerome, long ago, had shrewdness enough to say, that ‘ the scripture was not the shell, but the nut ; ’ by which he meant, that the *sentiment* of the Bible is the word of God, while the costume, that is, the words in which this sentiment is conveyed, was of minor importance.

So the apostles and so the Savior thought, for they have, in a multitude of cases (indeed, in almost all the appeals recorded in the New Testament), appealed to the authority of the Old Testament, by quoting the Septuagint version of it ; a version incomparably more incorrect, and differing from the original Hebrew in innumerable more places, than the very worst version made in any modern times. But, *de minimis non curat lex* ; a truly noble maxim ; yet one which superstition or ignorance knows not well how either to use or to estimate.

There is, then, no more danger, in supposing that very early there were different recensions of the Hebrew Scriptures, than in supposing, that there are different ones of the Scriptures of the New Testament, which all now admit ; for it is not a matter of opinion and judgment, but of *fact*. The Bible, spreading through the whole earth, and becoming the rule of life and salvation to all nations, is, at least, as important now, as it was when only one small nation admitted its claims. It is surely no more an objection, then, against the watchful care of Providence over the church and the records of its holy religion, to admit that divers recensions of the Scriptures existed at an early age, than to admit that they now exist.

Thus much for the danger of the principle, which we have

admitted. We will now add, that if those who cherish any apprehensions of the kind which we have endeavored to remove, will faithfully examine the Hebrew Scriptures as they now stand, they will find discrepancies in the recensions of the same compositions, which stand inserted in different places of the sacred records. Let them compare, for example, 2 Samuel xxii, and Psalm xviii ; Psalm xiv, and Psalm liii ; Psalm cv, and 1 Chronicles xvi. 7, seq. If this do not satisfy them, we will point them to some more appalling comparisons, which they may make by reading Ezra ii, in connexion with Nehemiah vii. 6, seq. It were very easy to extend the same kind of comparisons to a multitude of places in the books of Kings and Chronicles, where the result would be the same. Those who have examined such matters, never can doubt how they stand ; it is only those who have *not* examined them, that pronounce a judgment which has its foundation only in their own theological views, or depends on reasoning *à priori*. Facts cannot be denied ; nor can facts be theorized away.

In the end, which is the safer way, in respect to the interests of truth and religion ; to assume positions on mere doctrinal grounds, and established only by reasoning *à priori*, which will be overthrown by the careful examination of facts ; or to examine facts first, and then to make out positions that are not liable to be overthrown ? The first method may wear the appearance of zeal and deep concern for the honor of the Bible ; but zeal without knowledge is not very auspicious to the best interests of the truth. The fact is, too, that in many cases of such zeal, it amounts to very little more than a cloak to cover ignorance of a matter, which men have not studied, and which it gives them pain to see that others have. How prone men are to regard that as worthless, which they do not possess, or to decry it, and make it obnoxious, need not be proved, after all the facts which lie before the world relative to such matters.

For our part, we believe that truth needs no concealment ; and that, at the present day, it admits none. The Bible has nothing to fear from examination. It has ever been illustrated and confirmed by it. We doubt not it will be still more so. But, all pious fraud, all ‘expurgatory indexes,’ all suppression of facts and truths of any kind, only prove injurious, at last, to the cause, which they are designed to aid. This is a sufficient reason for abjuring them forever ; not to insist on the disingenuousness, which is implied in every artifice of this nature.

The fact, that various readings are found, not only in different classes of manuscripts, which have come down to us through different channels, but in cases where the same original documents are inserted in different places of the same class of manuscripts, is proved beyond contradiction. The first, by the actual comparison of manuscripts; the second, by a comparison of such parts of Scriptures as we have last alluded to above. Such a comparison may be extended very much farther, indeed to a great portion of the books of Chronicles, by reading them in connexion with the parallel passages in the books of Kings, and other parts of the Old Testament. Jahn's Hebrew Bible is not only the best, but the only work, which will enable one to do this without any trouble, as he has disposed of the whole books of the Chronicles in the way of harmony with other parts of Scripture. One thorough perusal and study of this, will effectually cure any sober man of all extravagant positions and theories about the letters and apexes of the Bible, and probably of all extravagant notions about *verbal* inspiration. Those who have never examined, are the only persons to be confident in such *minima* as these; those who have, pass by them in silence.

But we are diverging from our way, and hasten to return. We have only one topic more, respecting the Samaritan Pentateuch, which remains briefly to be touched.

It will be understood, of course, by every scholar who knows anything of the Samaritan Pentateuch, that it is not in the Samaritan dialect, but in the proper Hebrew tongue, like the Pentateuch in our Hebrew bibles, except that it is written in the old Hebrew character, which the Samaritans have always retained, with only slight variations. Of this document, and this only, have we hitherto spoken, whenever the Samaritan Pentateuch has been named. But we come now to state, that there is a translation of the Hebrew Samaritan Pentateuch into the proper Samaritan dialect, which is a medium between the Hebrew and the Aramæan languages. This version is very ancient; having been made at least before the time of Origen, and not improbably near the commencement of the Christian era. It is very literal, and close to the original; and what is very remarkable, is almost exactly the counterpart of the original Hebrew Samaritan codex, as it now exists, with all its various readings. This shows, in a degree really surprising, how very carefully and accurately the Hebrew Pentateuch has been copied and preserved by the Samaritans, from the ancient times in which their

version was made. This is its greatest value to us ; although it is of importance as one of the best means of becoming acquainted with the Samaritan dialect, which has so few remains, and has been so long extinct as a spoken language.

Besides this version of so ancient a date, there is also a version made by Abusaid, in the eleventh or twelfth century, into the Samaritan Arabic dialect, that is, the Arabic as spoken by the Samaritans. The translator appears to have been a man of talents ; and he has often hit, in a very happy manner, upon the best way of expressing the real sentiment of the original text, in difficult passages.

There are also a few scattered remains of an ancient Greek version, made from the Samaritan Pentateuch, some of which have been collected together by Morin, Hottinger, and Montfaucon ; but they are too scanty to be of much critical value.

It is easy to perceive, from what has already been said respecting the important Scriptural documents extant among the Samaritans, that their language and history ought to be a matter of deep interest among biblical and oriental critics. It has in fact been occasionally so, at different periods, since the Samaritan Pentateuch was first brought to Europe. Among the older critics, Hottinger, Morin, Cellarius, Reland, Basnage, Castell, and Mill, distinguished themselves by cultivating an acquaintance with these subjects ; and they have left behind them various monuments of their progress in the knowledge of them. Among the more recent critics, Schnurrer, Bruns, De Sacy, Winer, and Gesenius, stand most distinguished for this sort of knowledge. The last, in a particular manner, has carried his researches far beyond any of his predecessors. In the year 1820, this celebrated critic made a visit to England, and examined the Samaritan manuscripts deposited in the library at Oxford. Castell, long ago, in his *Heptaglott Lexicon*, had mentioned some Samaritan documents, which have often been referred to by the name of *Liturgia Damascena*, from which he gave some extracts, in his *Annotationes Samariticæ*. These documents lay in the obscurity in which Castell left them, until Gesenius, on examining them, found them to be *hymns* of a religious nature. A minute examination enabled him to discover, that they were composed in an *alphabetical* way ; and this led to an arrangement of their several parts, which were before in a confused, chaotic state. From this discovery proceeded the second and third publications, which are named at the head of this article.

The first of these two is a discourse delivered, as the title indicates, during the solemnities of Christmas, before the university at Halle. It consists of a brief account of the state and sources of Samaritan literature, and an exposition of the theological opinions of the Samaritans, as deduced from the hymns in question. It appears that they are strenuous monotheists; that they have high ideas of the pure and spiritual nature of God; that they believe the world was created from nothing; that angels are emanations from the divinity; that the Mosaic law is of immediate divine origin; that the institution of the sabbath and of circumcision is of high and holy obligation; and finally, that the pious, after the rest of the grave, will be raised to a happy and glorious immortality. Nothing certain appears in the hymns, respecting the Messiah. Their views in former times with regard to him, are sufficiently plain, from what is said in John iv. respecting this subject. Their recent views are disclosed, by their correspondence with some of the literati of Europe. They expect a Messiah, who will restore the Mosaic worship, and with it their temple on mount Gerizim. He is also to make their nation very happy; and then to die and be buried with Joseph, that is, among the tribe of Ephraim. But when this will take place, they do not undertake to determine.

The *Anecdota Orientalia* (No. 3.) exhibits a number of the hymns above described, in the original Samaritan, accompanied by an Arabic version. This was doubtless made after the Samaritan had begun to be disused, and the Arabic to prevail. To these Gesenius has added a Latin version of his own, with copious notes that are filled with illustrations drawn from oriental sources, and from comparison with biblical and other writers. To the whole is appended a short glossary, comprising those Samaritan words not to be found in any of the usual Lexicons. A plate, at the close, exhibits the forms of the Samaritan letters, in different documents.

This is truly a most welcome present to the lovers and cultivators of oriental literature. A new source is now opened, which enables us further to pursue the study of the dialects kindred with the Hebrew; and easy means are furnished for doing it. Such are the triumphs which unremitted industry and persevering ardor achieve; while the timid and the indolent are yawning over what their fathers wrote, in their easy chairs by a comfortable fireside, unconcerned whether the Samaritans

and their language are brought out and exposed to light, or remain covered with darkness.

There is nothing in the Samaritan hymns, which absolutely determines their age. The probability is, that they were composed as early as the eighth or ninth century.

We give an extract from Gesenius' Latin translation of the first hymn, that our readers may see the kind of composition and sentiment which these Samaritan relics exhibit.

Non est Deus nisi unus.
Creator mundi,
Quis estimabit magnitudinem tuam ?
Fecisti eum magnifice,
Intra sex dies.

In lege tuâ magna et vera
Legimus sapimusque.
In quovis illorum dierum
Magnificâsti creaturas.

Magnificatæ sapientiâ tuâ
Nunciant excellentiam tuam,
Revelantque divinum tuum imperium
Non esse, nisi ad magnificandum te.

Creâsti sine defatigatione
Opera tua excelsa ;
Adduxisti ea e nihil
Intra sex dies.

Creâsti ea perfecta,
Non est in unico eorum defectus,
Conspiciendam præbuiisti perfectionem eorum,
Quia tu es dominus perfectionis.

Et quievisti citra defatigationem
Die septimo,
Et fecisti eum coronam
Sex diebus.

Vocâsti eum sanctum
Eumque fecisti caput
Tempus omni conventui [sacro],
Principem omnis sanctitatis.

Fecisti eum fœdus
Te inter et cultores tuos,
Docuisti custodiam ejus
Custodire custodientes eum.

Felices qui sabbatum celebrant,
Quique digni sunt benedictione ejus;
Umbra ejus sancta eos respirare facit,
Ab omni labore et defatigatione, &c.

The *Anecdota Orientalia* is very handsomely printed, on good paper, and with that almost unparalleled accuracy, which Gesenius generally exhibits, in all the works corrected by his own hand.

We are encouraged to hope that other oriental specimens of a similar nature will follow. The next number is to exhibit the *Book of Enoch*, in the Ethiopian language; which Gesenius believes to be the same book as that from which Jude, in his epistle, and all the early Christian Fathers, quoted. Whether this be the fact or not, we shall welcome the publication of the book; or of any other book, from which the language, the sentiment, or the literature of the Scriptures, can receive illustration.

ART. III.—*Poem delivered before the Connecticut Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, September 13, 1825.* By JAMES G. PERCIVAL. Svo. pp. 40. Boston. Richardson and Lord.

It is a rare thing for a poet of Mr Percival's genius and reputation to appear at the anniversary of one of our literary associations. It is equally rare to adopt blank verse in a poem designed for recitation, and to extend it to the length of eleven hundred lines. Genius and fame stand an unequal match against these unfavorable circumstances. Few hearers could listen without fatigue to any composition of so great length. Still less when there must be the constant struggle, ever disappointed and ever renewed, to trace the structure of the verse.

But however ill adapted it may be for recitation, no such disadvantages attend it as offered from the press. We receive it as a poem to be read, and we read it without regarding its fitness to be spoken. It comes to the public with that recommendation from the author's name, which ensures it a candid perusal. The character of the subject and the occasion render it an object of more than ordinary notice; while the reputation of its fertile author, and the peculiarities of his beautiful but wayward